

REMARKS

Telephone conferences between Examiner Glessner and Dennis Smid (one of the applicants) and between Examiner Canfield and Mr. Smid were held on July 14, 2005. Mr. Smid and Mr. Palmesino (the other applicant) wish to thank Examiners Glessner and Canfield for their time and consideration for such conferences.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner stated that the reply filed on December 20, 2004 "is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): The applicant has not properly amended the claims. When adding subject matter to the claims, said matter should be underlined and when deleting subject matter from the claims, said matter should be located in brackets. All corrections should be done with respect to the original claims. The deleted matter should not be lined through. The applicant has not show (sic) any of the amendments in the above manner for claims 2-8, 10-14, 18, 20." This matter was discussed with Examiners Glessner and Canfield during the July 14 telephone conferences. The present amendment is believed to incorporate the comments provided by Examiners Glessner and Canfield during such telephone conferences. If, however, the Examiner believes that any such changes do not comply with the proper procedures for reissue amendments, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner kindly identify which portion or portions of a claim or claims do not comply therewith.

Remarks submitted in the March 15, 2004 amendment are resubmitted below.

An interview between Examiner Glessner and Dennis Smid was held on October 23, 2003.

Mr. Smid wishes to thank the Examiner for his time and consideration during such interview. Claims 3, 4, 19, and 21,

and amended claims 2, 5-8, 10-14, 18, 20, and 23-28 are in this application.

Independent claim 8 has been amended herein in the manner discussed during the October 23 interview. During such October 23 interview, the Examiner indicated that such amended claim 8 would distinguish over Robell and Putz. (See Interview Summary.) For similar or somewhat similar reasons, it is submitted that amended independent claims 18, 20, and 23-28 are also distinguishable over Robell and Putz. Further, and as discussed during the October 23 interview, it is respectfully submitted that there is support for the added features in the claims. See, for example, Figs. 2-4 of the present application.

Claims 2-7, 10-14, 19, and 21 are dependent from one of the amended independent claims and, as such, are also distinguishable over Robell and Putz for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now in this application (i.e., claims 2-8, 10-14, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 23-28) are allowable, and an early official notice to that effect is solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicants' attorney at (908) 518-6374 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 10/043,454

Docket No.: DSMID 3.0-001 RE

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: July 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicants

579827\_1.DOC